

Remarks

The present amendment is being filed in response to the Official Action mailed on May 12, 2005. That Official Action objected to the title of the application as not being descriptive. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10 and 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Croyle et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,583,801 ("Croyle"). Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croyle in view of Orton U.S. Patent No. 5,107,387 ("Orton"). Claims 5-9 and 17-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Title Objection

The title of the application has been amended to be more clear and distinct, and substantially incorporates the Examiner's suggestions.

The Art Rejections

All of the art rejections rely upon Croyle, which does not anticipate or render obvious claims 1-4 and 10-16, as discussed in greater detail below.

Croyle describes a system for trouble shooting computer controlled machinery. Col. 1, lines 9-12. The system of Croyle includes a unit 100 connected to a probe unit 80 by a flexible wire. The unit 100 includes a CPU 170 which controls the operation of the system and executes a test program to troubleshoot machinery. The test program causes the unit 100 to deliver instructions to a repairperson via a voice synthesizer 120. These instructions provide the repairperson with step-by-step instructions for using the unit 100 to test a particular piece of machinery. The probe unit 80 includes a probe 34 and "five buttons 81-85 which are used by the user to respond to instructions from the test program." Col. 6, lines 11-19.

As described at col. 8, lines 53-62, to test the output of a particular component, the repairperson is "instructed to place the tip of the probe 34 onto an electrical connection point where the voltage signal can be measured." The voltage sampled by the probe 34 is then conveyed back to the CPU 170 over the flexible wire. If the sampled voltage is determined to be not within acceptable parameters by the CPU 170, the repairperson may be instructed to replace that component.

In addition to reading a voltage, the unit 100 may also provide a voltage to test an output device, such as a solenoid valve. Col. 9, line 31. The repairperson would be instructed to place the probe 34 in the appropriate location, and the unit 100 would supply a control voltage through the probe tip. The CPU 170 “would ask the user to observe the device...while it activates the device.” Col. 9, lines 35-38. The CPU 170 would then “ask for a user response. The user depresses the NO or YES keys 81,82 to respond. If the CPU decides the device...is defective, it will instruct the user to replace it.” Col. 9, lines 39-43. The repairperson, or user, does not utilize the keys 81-85 on the probe unit 80 to cause the probe 34 to output a voltage. Rather, the test program on the CPU determines when to output the voltage and then utilizes the keys 81-85 to receive input from the user relating to what the voltage caused to occur.

In stark contrast to the relied upon art, the present invention switches an input voltage to a conductive wand tip based on the position of a user controlled switch device. See claim 1, for example, which recites a “power probe control unit adapted to selectably switch the power switching circuitry based on the position of the user controlled switch device.” See also claim 16, for example, which includes “switching, by the power probe control unit, the power switching circuitry based on the state of the user controlled switch.” Croyle does not teach or render obvious such an approach. Simply put, Croyle does not teach switching the power switching circuitry based on the position of the user controlled switch device.


Additionally, Croyle does not teach or render obvious the claimed technique of the power probe control unit sending a query message to the power probe wand, and the power probe wand sending a response to the power probe control unit in response to the query message, with the response indicating the position of the user controlled switch device. Croyle, as described above, merely teaches that the test program asks the user questions, and that in response the user responds to the questions using the keys 81-85. See col. 6, lines 11-19, of Croyle. Croyle does not teach a “power probe control unit adapted to send a query message to the power probe wand, [and] said power probe wand adapted to send a response to the power probe control unit in response to the query message, said response indicating the position of the user controlled switch device”, as claimed in claim 1, for example. See also claim 16.

Thus, applicants believe that independent claims 1 and 16, and the associated dependent claims, define over the relied upon art and are in order for allowance. If, after considering the present arguments, the Examiner believes that any issues remain, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss these issues.

Conclusion

All of the pending claims appearing to be in order for allowance, prompt allowance of the present application is requested. Any questions regarding this application may be raised by telephone with the undersigned if it is considered that processing of this application will be expedited thereby.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. R. Quinley", written over a horizontal line.

Steven R. Quinley
Registration No. 47,012
Static Control Components, Inc.
3010 Lee Avenue
Sanford, NC 27331
(919) 774-3808 ext. 1320